



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Great Britain, indicted before the bar of the assembled nations as guilty, along with other European statesmen, for the recent war and as supporters of a sort of diplomacy, statecraft, and imperialistic militarism for which Canada would not stand and which she does not propose to accept—and this indictment by one of Canada's leading political leaders, who, by the way, is a leading Christian layman of the Dominion and a promoter of social reforms. We refer to Mr. N. W. Rowell, of Ontario.

Nor is it without considerable significance that again and again at the Geneva Conference, the United States being unrepresented, the Canadian delegates have presumed to speak not only for Canada, but for public opinion in the United States on definite concrete propositions. It was informal, to be sure, and without any official warrant, but grew out of the propinquity of the two countries. Their common, democratic political ideals and customs, their substantial agreement as populations with the same pioneering experience and the same economic problems, and last, but not least, the fact that, living side by side for more than a century, Canada and the United States have kept the peace without forts on their borders and armed craft in their waters—these facts enabled Canada to speak freely.

The notice which Canada is serving on the world at the present time, that she will not be party to European nations' politics, diplomacy, and territorial ambitions, and that she sympathizes with the United States in her disinclination to become entangled in a hard-and-fast compact dealing with boundaries and nationalistic ambitions will have a repercussion far beyond the halls at Geneva. Downing Street will consult Ottawa oftener, will play the game with more of the cards on the table, and will realize that while she has lost a daughter she also has won a sister who thinks for herself and who hates war. The United States will be heartened by understanding that at Ottawa there is to be a government hereafter that thinks more in New World than in Old World terms, and that can be won, perchance, in the course of time to an All-Americas' policy based on modes of settling international disputes without force; for South America also has shown at Geneva that it is against control of the League by the dominant powers of Europe.

Yet another rôle seems to be opening up for Canada. It was hinted at in a recent speech by Ambassador Geddes, who has arrived in the New World at a time when relations between Great Britain and the United States are somewhat strained, though not to the extent seemingly that they are between Great Britain and France. Ambassador Geddes has suggested that if ever

the Anglo-American situation becomes acute, the New Canada, with its mounting nationalism and independence, and with its close educational, literary, commercial, and industrial ties with the United States, as well as its sentimental ties with Great Britain, could well be relied upon to mediate any dispute. The Canadian knows John Bull. He also knows Brother Jonathan. Neither London nor Washington are going to be able ever again to treat Ottawa with the condescending superiority of a fond parent or a rich neighbor; which fact, of itself, is a wholesome sign for tomorrow.

THE MATTER OF DISARMAMENT

IT SHOULD cause no surprise that the question of the universal reduction of armaments should be a matter of concrete concern to all nations. Some form of armament limitation, at least, is now imperative. The Financial Conference at Brussels, through its committee on public finance, issued a series of resolutions, in one of which occurs the significant passage which Lord Robert Cecil saw fit to quote in his address before the Assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva, November 17. The passage reads:

"It is, therefore, imperative that every government should, as the first social and financial reform on which all others depend, restrict its ordinary recurrent expenditure, including the service of the debt, to such an amount as can be covered by its ordinary revenue; rigidly reduce all expenditure of armaments in so far as such reduction is compatible with the preservation of national security; abandon all unproductive extraordinary expenditure and restrict even productive extraordinary expenditure to the lowest possible amount. The Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, in its pronouncement of March 8th, declared that armies should everywhere be reduced to a peace footing and armaments reduced to the lowest possible figure compatible with national security, and that the League of Nations should be invited to consider as soon as possible proposals to this end. The statements presented to the conference show that on the average some 20 per cent of the national expenditures is still being devoted to the maintenance of armaments and preparations for war. The conference desires to affirm that the world cannot afford this expenditure. Only by a frank policy of mutual co-operation can the nations hope to regain their old prosperity, and in order to secure that result the whole resources of each country must be devoted to strictly productive purposes. The conference accordingly recommends most earnestly to the Council of the League of Nations the desirability of conferring at once with the several governments concerned with a view to securing a general and agreed reduction of the crushing burden which, on their existing scale, armaments still impose on the impoverished peoples of the world, sap-

ping their resources and imperilling their recovery from the ravages of war."

This sentence follows:

"The conference hopes that the Assembly of the League, which is about to meet, will take any energetic action to this end."

On the 11th of December the Committee on Disarmament of the Assembly reported, favoring in substance, first, an agreement among the powers to make no further increase in armaments; second, a gradual reduction of armaments; third, general complete disarmament except in so far as arms are needed for police purposes. On the same day Senator Walsh, a Democrat and strong supporter of the League of Nations, introduced a resolution, afterward referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, calling upon the President to express to the Council of the League of Nations the earnest desire of the United States to co-operate with the commission appointed by the Council in the formulation of plans looking to the reduction of armaments. On the day that Secretary Daniels asked Congress to appropriate nearly \$700,000,000 for the United States Navy for the current year, it was announced that President-elect Harding was to be urged to take the initiative in behalf of the five-year "Naval Holiday" for England, Japan, and the United States. Major General Tasker H. Bliss, speaking in Philadelphia December 10, addressed himself to the subject "The Limitation of Armaments." General Bliss, who was our military representative on the Supreme War Council and one of President Wilson's commissioners at the Paris Peace Conference, expressed the problem with such clarity that we hope to print at least its essential parts in an early number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. Among other things, he declared that there can be no enduring and effective association of the nations so long as those nations are armed to the teeth against each other. He added, that neither can there be a successful court of arbitration so long as the present military system exists, since with preparedness such as is now in vogue any faithless nation always will be able to break agreements and defy the other nations.

Looking at the matter from the point of view of the nation embarrassed least of all, namely, the United States of America, the situation requires attention, and that right early. Faced with a deficit of one and a quarter billions, even this great country can't go on indefinitely spending ninety-three cents out of every one-hundred for the unproductive purposes of war.

The problem is not simple. It is very difficult; possibly the most difficult of all international problems. In any event, it is one of the most vital of all. Dr.

Christian Lange, of the Norwegian delegation to the Assembly of the League of Nations, expressed the view thus:

"The greatest authorities are unanimous in declaring that if the League of Nations does not make a decisive effort to pull the nations of the world out of the vicious circle and the dangerous habit of outbidding each other in armaments, it will deceive those hopes which the people of the world have built upon it. It would be a blow from which it would never recover."

At this writing there is another significant fact relating to this desire to reduce armaments. December 14, Senator Borah introduced a joint resolution, known as S. J. Res. 225, authorizing the President of the United States to advise the governments of Great Britain and Japan that the Government of the United States is ready to take up with them the question of disarmament. This resolution, which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, reads:

Whereas a representative and official of the Japanese Government has advised the world that the Japanese Government could not consent even to consider a program of disarmament on account of the naval building program of the United States; and

Whereas by this statement the world is informed and expected to believe that Japan sincerely desires to support a program of disarmament, but cannot in safety to herself do so on account of the attitude and building program of this government; and

Whereas the only navies whose size and efficiency requires consideration on the part of this government in determining the question of the size of our Navy are those of Great Britain and of Japan, two governments long associated by an alliance; and

Whereas the United States is now and has ever been in favor of a practical program of disarmament: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the governments of Great Britain and Japan, respectively, that this government will at once take up directly with their governments and without waiting upon the action of any other nation the question of disarmament, with a view of quickly coming to an understanding by which the building naval programs of each of said governments, to wit, that of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States, shall be reduced annually during the next five years 50 per cent of the present estimates or figures.

Second, that it is the sense of the Congress, in case such an understanding can be had, that it will conform its appropriation and building plans to such agreement.

Resolved, further, That this proposition is suggested by the Congress of the United States to accomplish immediately a substantial reduction of the naval armaments of the world.